NO FURTHER ACCELERATED ACTION JUSTIFICATION FOR ASH PITS

PAC REFERENCE NUMBER(s) SW-133 1, 133 2, 133 4, and 1702

IHSS Reference Numbers

SW-133 1, SW-133 2, SW-133 4, and PAC SW-1702

Unit Name

Ash Pits

Approximate Location N748,000, E2,080,000

Date(s) of Operation or Occurrence

1950s - 1968

Description of Operation or Occurrence

In 1970, four burial sites (trenches [SW-133 1, SW-133 2, SW-133 3, and SW-133 4]) were located south of the incinerator area (IHSS 133 5) These trenches were used for disposal of ash (and noncombustible trash) from the incinerator that operated from approximately 1952 until 1968 Noncombustible trash, such as counting discs, broken glassware, and metal, was collected in a nearby dumpster and later disposed of in the trenches The trenches are approximately 150 to 200 feet long, 12 feet wide, and 10 feet deep, and have been staked with steel fence posts and surveyed Approximately 3 feet of soil covers each trench location Two additional burial trenches (PAC SW-1701 and SW-1702) were identified in 1994 (DOE 1996) based on anomalies found during a time-domain electromagnetic (TDEM) conductivity survey These two additional areas were confirmed through review of aerial photographs and samples collected from boreholes in the immediate area (Figure 1)

Ash from the incinerator and "dump area" was monitored in 1959 (DOE 1992) Activities of 4,000 counts per minute (cpm) alpha and 30 millirems per hour (mr/hr) beta were observed Subsequently, the ash was buried in a trench Special air sampling of the Plant incinerator was conducted in 1958 to address concerns of burning potentially contaminated waste from Buildings 444 and 447

Physical/Chemical Description of Constituents Released

In September 1954, five ash samples from the burning of Building 991 wastes were collected The average activity of the ash was 4.5 x 10⁷ disintegrations per minute per kilogram (dpm/kg) of dry ash The alpha activity of the ash was approximately 100 times higher than the usual ash samples from the incinerator

In 1956, special monitoring was performed during and after contaminated waste was burned in the Plant incinerator Ash samples indicated 1.9 grams of radioactive material (depleted uranium) per kilogram of ash Smear surveys of the incinerator before and after

April 2, 2003

ADMIN RECORD

OU05-A-000712

burning showed no increase in contamination. It was estimated that approximately 30,000 cubic feet of soil and ash were buried in the trenches

Small quantities of depleted uranium-contaminated combustibles were burned along with the general combustible Plant refuse. One estimate indicates that less than 100 grams of depleted uranium were in the combustibles. A monthly ash sampling program was initiated in January 1962 and indicated there was 1 to 8 kilograms of depleted uranium per ton of ash (DOE 1992).

Responses to Operation or Occurrence

Sampling events were conducted from November 24, 1953, through December 9, 1954 In 1970, the locations of Ash Pits 1-1 through 1-4 were marked in the field. The ash in these trenches was evaluated and considered to present no problems unless disturbed and inhaled

Fate of Constituents Released to Environment

The 2001 Annual Update for the Historical Release Report provides an NFA determination assessment for all of the Ash Pits—Based on the data and assessment provided in that update, NFAs were approved by the regulatory agencies for Ash Pit 3 (SW-133 3) and the Recently Identified Ash Pit (TDEM-1) [SW-1701] (EPA, CDPHE, 2002)—The regulatory agencies determined that additional data needed to be collected to render a NFA determination for the Incinerator Facility (SW-133 5) and the Concrete Wash Pad (SW-133 6)

Because of proposed modifications to RFCA Attachment 5, specifically, the introduction of new Action Levels (ALs) and the integrated risk-based approach (application of the Soil Risk Screen), Ash Pit 1 (SW-133 1), Ash Pit 2 (SW-133 2), Ash Pit 4 (SW-133 4), and the Recently Identified Ash Pit (TDEM-2) [SW-1702] have been reassessed to render a No Further Accelerated Action (NFAA) determination. The data utilized in this assessment are the same as provided in the 2001 Annual Update for these PACs

The ash pit sites and surrounding area were extensively sampled as part of the Final OU 5 RFI/RI (DOE 1996) and through groundwater and surface water monitoring. The locations of boreholes, wells, surface soil samples, sediment samples, and surface water samples used in this evaluation are shown on Figure 1. Data presented in this narrative are comprehensive, up-to-date information, retrievable from RFETS database archives. RFCA Action levels (ALs) are from the proposed modifications to RFCA Attachment 5, dated. November 12, 2002 (DOE, 2002). Background levels for subsurface soil are from the Background Geochemical Characterization Report (DOE 1993). Background values for surface soils and sediments are from Geochemical Characterization of Background Surface. Soils Background Soils Characterization Program (DOE 1995). All background values used for comparison are the mean background value plus two standard deviations. Table 1 lists the trenches and associated boreholes and/or wells.

Analysis of 18 surface soil samples from across the ash pit area did not indicate metals are present above the ALs, and with the exception of one sediment sample where arsenic is 17.3 mg/kg (bkg -13.1 mg/kg), they are not present above background (Table 6)

In addition to laboratory analysis for radionuclides, a High Purity Germanium (HPGe) survey of the entire area was conducted in 1993 Figures 2, 3 and 4 show the survey results for americium-241, uranium-235, and uranium-238 Americium was not detected at statistically significant levels. This result suggests the absence of plutonium. Concentrations of the uranium isotopes were all well below the ALs. Consequently, the excavation of surface soil is not required.

APPLICATION OF THE SOIL RISK SCREEN

Screen 1 – Are COC Concentrations Below Table 3 Soil Action Levels for the Wildlife Refuge Worker?

No As shown in Tables 2 through 5, the maximum concentrations of uranium isotopes and a few metals <u>in pit material buried to a depth of approximately 3 feet</u> exceed the ALs as follows

SW-133 1 – Uranium-235 and Uranium-238 (Table 2)

SW-133.2 - Chromium, Uranium-235 and Uranium-238 (Table 3)

SW-133 4 - Uranium-235 and Uranium-238 (Table 4)

SW-1702 - Chromium, Lead, and all of the Uranium isotopes (Table 5)

Analysis of 18 surface soil samples from across the ash pit area did not indicate metals are present above the ALs, and with the exception of one sediment sample where arsenic is 17.3 mg/kg (bkg 13.1 mg/kg), they are not present above background (Table 6)

In addition to laboratory analysis for radionuclides, a High Purity Germanium (HPGe) survey of the entire area was conducted in 1993. Figures 2, 3 and 4 show the survey results for americium 241, uranium 235, and uranium 238. Americium was not detected at statistically significant levels. This result suggests the absence of plutonium. Concentrations of the uranium isotopes were all well below the ALs. These results confirm that uranium is the only radionuclide of concern in this area, and the contamination is largely confined to the material within the Ash Pits.

Screen 2 – Is there a potential for subsurface soil to become surface soil (landslide and erosion areas identified on Figure 1)?

Yes As shown in Figure 5, the ash pits are located in an area that was mapped as being prone to landslides

Evaluate accelerated action in accordance with Section 4 C and 5 C and consider any subsequent screens in the evaluation, as appropriate

As noted in Screen 1, the maximum concentrations of uranium isotopes and a few metals exceed the ALs at the Ash Pits However, with the exception of PACs SW-133 2 and SW-1702, the average concentrations are well below the ALs At SW-133 2, the average chromium concentration (429 7 mg/kg) exceeds the AL of 268 mg/kg. However, the average concentration is 1/20th of the maximum concentration indicating the maximum chromium concentration is an isolated zone of contamination not representative of the balance of the material present in the PAC. At SW-1702, the average concentration of lead (1223 mg/kg) and uranium-235 (9 7 pCi/g) exceed their respective ALs (1000 mg/kg and 8 pCi/g). However, these exceedances are relatively small, i.e., they are within 20-25% of the ALs.

Although the Ash Pits are located in an area that has been mapped as a landshide deposit, a visual inspection of the area indicates it has a broad, gently sloping (~8% grade) surface, with no evidence of recent landshide activity. Also, the area has a well-established vegetative cover, which will minimize erosion from runoff

Because the Ash Pits are near Woman Creek, bank erosion and eventual down-cutting into the Ash Pits is another potential mechanism to expose contaminated subsurface soil However, the closest Ash Pit, SW-133 6 [not under evaluation here], is 80 – 100 ft from the creek. Over the past 60 years, there is no discernable bank erosion based on overlaying a relatively recent aerial photo transparency (ca. 1992) on a 1937 aerial photo with the same scale. Furthermore, the Ash Pits are outside the 100 year floodplain (Figure 6).

One final mechanism to be addressed with respect to potential exposure of subsurface contaminated soil is the action of burrowing animals Typically A prairie dogs ean burrow to-depths of approximately 6 feet and thus potentially bring contaminated subsurface soil to the surface However, it must be recognized that the Ash Pits area is relatively small (~20 acres) compared to the human exposure unit sizes being considered for the comprehensive risk assessment (on the order of several hundred 500 acres) Accordingly, the incremental impact from this activity is small. Furthermore, any soil that would be brought to the surface would be mixed with uncontaminated overlying soil during the burrowing activity

Screen 3 – Does subsurface soil contamination for radionuclides exceed criteria defined in Section 5 3 and Attachment 14?

April 2, 2003 4

¹ The future exposure of subsurface contamination due to burrowing animals has been addressed in the recent modifications to the RFCA Action Level Framework

No As shown in Tables 2 through 5, plutonium and americium concentrations are well below the soil Als action level of 50 and 76 pCi/g respectively, and therefore, further analysis is not required

Some uranium isoptoes, as noted in Screen 1, exceed WRW levels, however, approximately three feet of uncontaminated to slightly contaminated soils were previously placed over the pit materials. This cover sufficinetly protects the WRW from direct exposure and eliminates the need for an accelerated action.

Screen 4 – <u>Is there an environmental pathway and sufficient quantity of COC that would cause exceedance of SWS?</u> Is there (or will there be) a groundwater treatment system intercepting groundwater to treat COCs originating from the IHSS, AOC, or OU?

No Although a groundwater treatment system is not and will not be in place to intercept groundwater from the Ash Pits, as discussed under Screen 6, groundwater does not appear to be a significant pathway for COC migration to surface water Current groundwater monitoring does not indicate groundwater contamination in this area, however, the number and location of groundwater wells will be evaluated between now and Site closure

Contaminant migration via erosion and groundwater are the two possible pathways whereby surface water could become contaminated by the Ash Pits. The erosion pathway can be eliminated because surface soil is largely uncontaminated in the vicinity of the Ash Pits (Table 6 and Figures 2 through 4), and deep erosion is unlikely as discussed in the evaluation presented after Screen 2. However, because groundwater is a possible pathway whereby Woman Creek could become contaminated by the Ash Pits, groundwater chemistry has been evaluated for evidence of contamination. Subsequently, Woman Creek surface water quality is assessed.

Downgradient Groundwater Quality

Data from wells in the vicinity of the Ash Pits were evaluated to determine whether there is an impact to groundwater Groundwater quality data are summarized in Table 7, and are discussed with respect to each of the PACs below

SW-133 1 (and SW-133 3) - One well, 56294, is immediately downgradient of these PACs No contaminants were detected above RFCA Tier I ALs and only thallium was found above Tier II Thallium is not a soil contaminant at SW-133 1 (Table 2). It is also not a contaminant at SW-133 3 (see 2001 Annual Update for the HRR).

SW-133 2 - Downgradient of this PAC aluminum concentrations in groundwater were greater than the RFCA Tier II AL in well 58793, thallium was reported once at a concentration greater than the RFCA Tier II AL in well 63793, and uranium-233,234 and uranium-238 concentrations were greater than RFCA Tier II ALs in wells 58793, 63693, and 63793 downgradient of this PAC. Aluminum and thallium are not soil contaminants at PAC 133 2 (Table 3). Although uranium-233/234 and uranium-238 have maximum soil concentrations that are well above background, the average concentrations are more than an order of magnitude less, 1 e, the significant uranium contamination in the subsurface soil is

<u>isolated</u>, and therefore, the PAC does not appear to be a significant source for groundwater uranium contamination

SW-133.4 and SW-1702 - The nearest downgradient well (63093) contained methylene chloride concentrations above detection limit and uranium-233/234 and uranium-238 concentrations above Tier II ALs. This well was sampled numerous times, and methylene chloride was only detected once. Additionally, methylene chloride is not present in soil at SW-133.4 or SW-1702 (Table 4 and 5). Like SW-133.2, the maximum concentrations for all three uranium isotopes are well above background in subsurface soil at PAC SW-133.4 (Table 4) and SW-1702 (Table 5), however, the average concentrations are approximately an order of magnitude less. Again, the significant uranium contamination in the subsurface soil at these PACs is isolated, and therefore, the PACs do not appear to be significant sources for groundwater uranium contamination.

The above assessment indicates that only uranium-233, 234 and uranium-238 are groundwater contaminants that may have arisen from the Ash Pits, specifcally PAC SW-133 2, SW-133 4 and SW-1702 More recent data was collected for well 63093 and well 5686 directly downgradient in the Woman Creek drainage (Table 8). The new uranium data for well 63093 indicates similar uranium concentrations to that of previous data. The concentrations of these uranium isotopes further downgradient in the drainage (5686) are below Tier II ALs, which indicates attenuation (dilution, dispersion, adsorption) has reduced the concentrations to levels of no concern. Indeed, the uranium concentrations in groundwater at all locations downgradient of the Ash Pits are below the surface water standard for Woman Creek of 11 pCi/l of total uranium.

Downgradient Surface Water Quality

As shown in Table 9, aluminum, antimony, cadmium, copper, iron, lead, manganese, mercury, silver, americium-241, gross alpha, gross beta, and plutonium- 239/240 concentrations in nearby surface water locations have occurred at concentrations exceeding the surface water ALs. However, the previous analysis regarding surface soil, subsurface soil, and groundwater contamination strongly suggests that uranium is the only contaminant with potential, albeit low, to migrate to surface water from the Ash Pits via groundwater. Because uranium is not a contaminant that exceeds surface water ALs in Woman Creek, the Ash Pits are not impacting surface water quality. Furthermore, water quality data at downgradient station SW027 (surface water point of evaluation [POE]) and at Pond C-2, indicate these contaminants have never been detected above RFCA surface water ALs

Screen 5 – Are COC concentrations below the Table 3 Soil Action Levels for ecological receptors?

At this time, ecological Als are not available for all receptors/chemical combinations however, values are available for a small subset of chemicals. Screen 5 currently evaluates only this subset and the remainder will be addressed through the ecological risk assessment portion of the Comprehensive Risk Assessemnt (CRA)

No- As shown below, maximum concentrations for beryllium and/or lead exceed the ecological ALs in all of the Ash Pits, and in several cases, the average concentrations also exceed the ALs. The highest concentrations of lead and beryllium are observed in PAC 1702 where the average concentrations exceed the ALs by approximately an order of magnitude (Table 5)

PAC Sugar			
SW-133 1	Beryllium	Yes	No
SW-133 1	Lead	Yes	Yes
SW-133 2	Beryllium	Yes	Yes
SW-133 2	Lead	Yes	Yes
SW-133 4	Beryllium	Yes	No
SW-133 4	Lead	Yes	Yes
SW-1702	Beryllium	Yes	Yes
SW-1702	Lead	Yes	Yes

Evaluate accelerated action in accordance with Section 4 <u>2.C</u>C and 5.<u>3.I</u>C and consider any subsequent screens in the evaluation, as appropriate

Per Section 4 <u>2 CG</u> of Attachment 5, DOE will consider the target species and the exposure unit for that species, and the location, areal extent, and concentration of contamination in evaluating and determining appropriate accelerated actions necessary to protect ecological resources

SW-1702 material contains average lead and beryllium concentrations that significantly exceed the ecological ALs As a first step in evaluating the risk posed to the ecological receptors, the ecological receptor that is the basis for the AL was identified

<u>Beryllıum</u>

The beryllium AL of 2 15 mg/kg is based on protection of the prairie dog²

Lead

The lead AL of 25 6 mg/kg is based on protection of the American Kestrel Because the American Kestrel, a bird of prey would not be directly exposed to the buried material,

² It should be noted that the background beryllium concentration for subsurface soil is 14 2 mg/kg which exceeds the AL. In this case and in all cases where background levels exceed the AL for protection of ecological receptors, achieving background levels becomes the cleanup goal

Preliminary Remediation Goals (PRGs) for other ecological receptors were examined³ The PRGs for protection of the prairie dog and Prebles Jumping Mouse are 149 mg/kg and 642 mg/kg, respectively

As can be seen from Tables 1 through 5, SW-1702 has significantly higher concentrations of beryllium and lead than the other Ash Pits, and the average concentrations exceed the AL/PRG for burrowing animals. The average concentration of lead in the waste is less than a factor of two higher than the prairie dog-based PRG, however, both the beryllium and lead concentrations significantly exceed the Preble's Jumping Mouse-based PRG. Although the concentrations of these COC exceed the PRGs for protection of the Jumping Mouse, the mouse typically burrows to a depth of only 15 inches, and the buried material is 3 feet below ground surface at the Ash Pits per the Historical Release Report (DOE 1992). Therefore, it is unlikely that the Jumping Mouse will be exposed to the material. Furthermore, the areal extent of SW-1702 is relatively small compared to the habitat areas on Site, and accordingly, the risk to the Jumping Mouse (and prairie dog) is also proportionately low. Lastly, SW-1702 is in a Preble's Mouse habitat, and it is uncertain that removal of the buried material and disruption of the habitat would result in a net benefit to the Jumping Mouse.

Screen 6 Is there a potential to exceed Surface Water Standards at a POC²

Contaminant migration via erosion and groundwater are the two possible pathways whereby surface water could become contaminated by the Ash Pits. The erosion pathway can be eliminated because surface soil is largely uncontaminated in the vicinity of the Ash Pits (Table 6 and Figures 2 through 4), and deep erosion is unlikely as discussed in the evaluation presented after Screen 2. However, because groundwater is a possible pathway whereby Woman Creek could become contaminated by the Ash Pits, groundwater chemistry has been evaluated for evidence of contamination. Subsequently, Woman Creek surface water quality is assessed.

Downgradient Groundwater Quality

Data from wells in the vicinity of the Ash Pits were evaluated to determine whether there is an impact to groundwater—Groundwater quality data are summarized in Table 7, and are discussed with respect to each of the PACs below

SW-133 1 (and SW-133.3) - One well, 56294, is immediately downgradient of these PACs—No contaminants were detected above RFCA Tier I ALs and only thallium was found above Tier II—Thallium is not a soil contaminant at SW-133 1 (Table 2)—It is also not a contaminant at SW-133 3 (see 2001 Annual Update for the HRR)

April 2, 2003

³ The AL is the lowest PRG above Site background levels that was calculated for each of the five selected wildlife receptors judged to be representative of species at RFETS Preble's meadow jumping mouse and black tailed prairie dog (fossorial [burrowing] small mammals), mourning dove (small ground-feeding bird), terrestrial invertebrate (multiple species), and American kestrel (avian predator) See also footnote 2

SW-133.2 Downgradient of this PAC aluminum concentrations in groundwater were greater than the RFCA Tier II AL in well 58793, thallium was reported once at a concentration greater than the RFCA Tier II AL in well 63793, and uranium-233,234 and uranium-238 concentrations were greater than RFCA Tier II ALs in wells 58793, 63693, and 63793 downgradient of this PAC—Aluminum and thallium are not soil contaminants at PAC 133-2 (Table 3)—Although uranium-233/234 and uranium-238 have maximum soil concentrations that are well above background, the average concentrations are more than an order of magnitude less, 1 e , the significant uranium contamination in the subsurface soil is isolated, and therefore, the PAC does not appear to be a significant source for groundwater uranium contamination.

SW-133 4 and SW-1702 - The nearest downgradient well (63093) contained methylene chloride concentrations above detection limit and uranium 233/234 and uranium 238 concentrations above Tier II ALs - This well was sampled numerous times, and methylene chloride was only detected once - Additionally, methylene chloride is not present in soil at SW-133 4 or SW-1702 (Table 4 and 5) - Like SW-133 2, the maximum concentrations for all three uranium isotopes are well above background in subsurface soil at PAC SW-133 4 (Table 4) and SW-1702 (Table 5), however, the average concentrations are approximately an order of magnitude less - Again, the significant uranium contamination in the subsurface soil at these PACs is isolated, and therefore, the PACs do not appear to be significant sources for groundwater uranium contamination

The above assessment indicates that only uranium 233, 234 and uranium 238 are groundwater contaminants that may have arisen from the Ash Pits, specifically PAC SW-133-2, SW-133-4 and SW-1702—More recent data was collected for well 63093 and well 5686 directly downgradient in the Woman Creek drainage (Table 8)—The new uranium data for well 63093 indicates similar uranium concentrations to that of previous data. The concentrations of these uranium isotopes further downgradient in the drainage (5686) are below Tier II ALs, which indicates attenuation (dilution, dispersion, adsorption) has reduced the concentrations to levels of no concern—Indeed, the uranium concentrations in groundwater at all locations downgradient of the Ash Pits are below the surface water standard for Woman Creek of 11 pCi/l of total uranium.

Downgradient Surface Water Quality

As shown in Table 9, aluminum, antimony, cadmium, copper, iron, lead, manganese, mercury, silver, americium-241, gross alpha, gross beta, and plutonium-239/240 concentrations in nearby surface water locations have occurred at concentrations exceeding the surface water ALs. However, the previous analysis regarding surface soil, subsurface soil, and groundwater contamination strongly suggests that uranium is the only contaminant with potential, albeit low, to migrate to surface water from the Ash Pits via groundwater. Because uranium is not a contaminant that exceeds surface water ALs in Woman Creek, the Ash Pits are not impacting surface water quality. Furthermore, water quality data at downgradient station SW027 (surface water point of evaluation [POE]) and at Pond C-2, indicate these contaminants have never been detected above RFCA surface water ALs.

Stewardship Analysis

Application of the Soil Risk Screen to the Ash Pits, specifically Ash Pit 1 (SW-133 1), Ash Pit 2 (SW-133 2), Ash Pit 4 (SW-133 4), and the Recently Identified Ash Pit (TDEM-2) [SW-1702], indicates No Further Action (NFA) is necessary for protection of public health and environment. However, because subsurface soil at some of these PACs has contaminant concentrations that exceed soil ALs, both near-term and long-term stewardship actions have been recommended⁴. They are discussed below

Near-Term Management Recommendations

Near-term recommendations for environmental stewardship include the following

- Continued groundwater monitoring to evaluate potential impacts to surface water quality,
- Excavation at the area will continue to be controlled through the Site Soil Disturbance Permit process, and
- Site access and security controls will remain in place pending implementation of long-term controls

Long-Term Stewardship Recommendations

Based on remaining environmental conditions at the Ash Pits, no specific long-term stewardship activities are recommended beyond the generally applicable Site requirements that may be imposed on this area in the future, which are dependent upon the final remedy selected Institutional controls that may will be used as appropriate for this area include the following

- Prohibitions on construction of buildings,
- Restrictions on excavation or other soil disturbance, and
- Prohibitions on groundwater pumping in the area of the Ash Pits, -and
- Monitoring for or prevention of intrusion by burrowing animals

It is also proposed that the groundwater monitoring network in the vicinity of the Ash Pits be evaluated between now and Site closure to determine its adequacy in detecting releases from the Ash Pits A new well(s) will be added if appropriate Furthermore, a marker will be placed near the southwestern corner of the western most ash pit Woman Creek downslope from SW-133-6-to monitor bank erosion, if any, that may occur These specific long-term stewardship recommendations will also be summarized in the Rocky Flats Long Term Stewardship Strategy No engineered controls, other environmental monitoring, or physical controls (e.g., fences) are recommended as a result of the conditions remaining at the Ash Pits

April 2, 2003

⁴ The Ash Pits are contiguous with the Industrial Area (IA) where subsurface soil contaminant concentrations will likely exceed soil ALs at some locations. Considering the large size of the IA relative to the Ash Pits, there would be no significant reduction in the area requiring near-term and long-term stewardship actions if the contaminated subsurface soil at the Ash Pits were removed

The Ash Pits will be evaluated as part of the Sitewide Comprehensive Risk Assessment, which is part of the RCRA Facility Investigation/Remedial Investigation (RFI/RI) and Corrective Measures Study/Feasibility Study (CMS/FS) that will be conducted for the Site. The need for and extent of any, more general, long-term stewardship activities will also be analyzed in RFI/RI and CMS/FS and will be proposed as part of the preferred alternative in the Proposed Plan for the Site. Institutional controls and other long-term stewardship requirements for Rocky Flats will ultimately be contained in the Corrective Action Decision/Record of Decision, in any post-closure Colorado Hazardous Waste Act permit that may be required, and in any post-RFCA agreement

NFAA Summary

Ash Pit 1 (SW-133 1), Ash Pit 2 (SW-133 2), Ash Pit 4 (SW-133 4), and the Recently Identified Ash Pit (TDEM-2) [SW-1702] are proposed for NFAA The Soil Risk Screen and soil ALs proposed in the RFCA Attachment 5 Modification dated 11/12/02 have been applied to these PACs The risk screen shows an insignificant potential adverse risk to a wildlife refuge worker because the waste is buried, and the Ash Pits area, although located in a landslide deposit, is in a stable configuration having a gently slope, and a well established vegetative cover to minimize erosion. It is possible a burrowing animal may bring contaminated soil to the surface, however, the incremental risk to the wildlife refuge worker is small because the Ash Pits area is relatively small compared to the exposure unit size for the worker Although concentrations of lead and beryllium exceed the Preble's meadow Jumping Momouse PRG, particularly in PAC 1702, the mouse typically burrows to a depth of only 15 inches, and there is 3 feet of soil cover on the Ash Pit Furthermore, the volume of waste and areal extent of PAC 1702 is relatively small, and accordingly, the risk to the Jumping Mouse is also proportionately low. There is little potential for contaminated runoff to impact surface water quality because the waste is buried and covered, the Ash Pits are located far enough from Woman Creek that it is unlikely that to preclude bank erosion would impact the Ash Pits, and they are located outside the 100 year flood plain Examination of groundwater quality indicates a potential for low level uranium contamination that may have arisen from the Ash Pits, but no impacts from other contaminants. However, uranium is not a contaminant that exceeds surface water ALs in Woman Creek, and therefore, there is no apparent impact to surface water quality from the Ash Pits Application of the Soil Risk Screen indicates no further accelerated action is required

References

DOE, 1992, Historical Release Report for the Rocky Flats Plant, Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, CO, June

DOE 1993, Background Geochemical Characterization Report, Golden, CO, September

DOE 1995, Geochemical Characterization of Background Surface Soils Background Soils Characterization Program, Golden, CO, May

11

DOE, 1996, Final Phase I RFI/RI Report, Woman Creek Drainage, Operable Unit 5, Vol 1, Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site, Golden, CO, April

EPA, CDPHE, 2002 Correspondence to J Legare, DOE RFO, from T Rehder, EPA Region VIII, S Gunderson, CDPHE, RE Approval of NFA Designation for IHSSs & PACs, February 14, 2002

Table 1-.Subsurface Soil Sampling Locations for Ash Pits

IHSS/PAC Number	Borehole/Well Locations
133 1	56293, 56393, 56493, 58893
133 2	56993, 57093, 57193, 57293, 57294, 57393, 57493, 59894,
133 4	55593, 55693, 55694, 55793, 55893, 55993, 56093, 58093, 58993, 59693, 63093,
SW-1702	55894, 55994, 56095

13

Table 2 - Summary of Analytical Results for Subsurface Soil at SW-133 1

Analyte	Samples	Maximum	Unit	Average	Action I ivel	
Amaire	Above	Concentration	Cint	Concentration	Action 1 tvei	Concentration
	Detection					
	Limit					
Mummum	11	24300	ու kւ	9820 9	228000	35 7 2
Americann 241	9	I	րԸւ չ	0 1	76	0 02
Antimony	2	,13	ուլ kg	26 5	409	170
Arsenic	11		mչ kչ	5	22 2	131
Barum	11	374	m _ե k <u>ե</u>	159 7	26400	289 4
Berythum	7	. 4	m_ kլ	14	921 8 71*	14 2
Cadmium	3	57	mg kg	20 7	962	1 7
Cilcium	_11	_4600	ուջ k_	7166 4		39 82
Cestum	1		տ _ե kե	1 0		
Chromium	11		mը kբ	115	268	68
Cobalt	11	37	nı, kg	11 0	1550	29 0
Copper	11	2920	m _{&} k _Ł	298 6	40900	78.2
Cross Alpha	12	742	p(۱ <u>٤</u>	78 9		43 5
Cross Beta	12	1580	ր(լ լ	171 0		36 8
Iron	11		ա _ե k _ե	139527	307000	11046 5
I cad	_11	260	m _ե k _ե	52 2	1000 97 7*	25 0
Lithium	_11		mg kբ	5.0	20400	34 7
Magnesium	<u>1</u> I	4670	mլk₌	2595.5		9315 4
Manganese	11	696	ուջ k	_28 >	3480	901 6
Mercury		0	ու_ kչ	0.0	25200	1 5
Molybdenum	1	2-1	mք k <u>ւ</u>	24 0	5110	25 6
Nickel	10	66	ւոչ kչ	21 3	20400	62 2
l lutonium 239/240	10		p(15	0 1	50	0 02
Fotassium	11	1680	m <u>ւ</u> kւ	986 ነ		6196 8
Sclenium	2	0	m _ե k <u>ե</u>	0.0	5110	4 8
Silver	3	158	m <u>ւ</u> kլ	57 3	5110	24 5
Sodium	[1]		m _e k _e	594.7		1251 2
Strontium	11	96	m _≂ Հ <u>բ</u>	52 7	Č13000	2114
l hallının	ז	1,	mը k_	<u> </u>		1.8
Lin	_1	16	m_ Հ <u>Է</u>	16.0	613000	286
Uranium 234	12		p(ı g	12 0	300	2 6
Lianium 235	11	20	p(ı/ <u>Ł</u>	2 0	8	0 12
Uranium 238	12	1130	pCi g	107 5	351	1 5
Vinadium	11	58	ու հե	24 4	7150	88 49
Zinc	11	891	m <u>ւ</u> k <u>ւ</u>	136 4	307000	139 1



^{*}AL for protection of wildlife refuge worker/AL for protection of ecological receptor

Table 3 - Summary of Analytical Results for Subsurface Soils at SW-133 2								
	Number of	Maximum	Unit	Average	Action I evel	Background		
	Samples							
	above	·						
	Detection Limit							
Aluminum	0	17100	m k)	11160	000אי י	53 17		
124 Irichlorobenzene	<u> </u>		us k	(0	> 0000			
1 2 Dichlorobenzene	1 (0	us k] o	31200000			
1 3 Dichlorobenzene		70	us k	0				
1 4 Dichlorobenzene	1	10	uı k	10	× 10000	_		
2 Chlorophenol	-1	_ 10	u k;	10	5110000			
2 Methylnaphth denc	1	10	и k	10	20 100000			
4 Chloro 3 Methylphenol	Ī	10	ս եչ	-10				
Americium 241	או		pC ı	0.3	76	0 02		
Antimony	7	149	ող ել	25 3	109	1697		
Arsenic	0		m, k		2,,	1 11		
Barium	20	414	ւլ /Kլ	151.7	26100	או נאי		
Benzo(a)pvi enc	1 -	10	u k	10	3420			
Beryllium	j	131	111 ks	16 4	921 8 71*	112		
Bis(2 I thylhcxyl)l hthalate]	J	us k	80	1970000			
Butyl Benzyl I hthalate	<u> </u>	50	us k	50	1 1 7000000			
Cadmiuin	(25	ms k	10.7	962	1 7		
Cikium	()	8 30	m k	s(0		- 10 47		
Chromium	20	8310	ող /kլ	429 /	268	68.3		
Cobalt	20	(8	m kį	113	1550	29 01		
Copper	20	1 180	ın⊢⁄kį	108 0	40 200	18 21		
Dibenzofuran	_ 1	l .	us ks	10	29 0000			
Dicthyl I hthalate]'		u k	10		L		
Di n Butyl Phihalate	<u> </u>		u, kı	2700	7 7000 <u>00</u>			
I luoranthene	J		u ki	10	_000000 2			
Cross Alpha	21		b(12	27 2	ļ	13 5		
Cross Beta	ا'	· — — -	p <u>Cı</u>	65 X		^ર (પ્ર		
Hexachlorobenzene	_ ՝	ī	u k	. 0				
lron]º	· —	m ks	200 1	307000	1101652		
i cad			mį kį			24 9		
1 ithium	1	 	m kı	7(20 100	160		
Magnesium		. –	m k	<u>' 11</u> 0	4	9 15 44		
Manganese	,0,			251				
Mercury	<u> </u>		ms ks	0.0	-	 :		
Molybdenum	¹ -— ¹	· —	m kį	151 25	5110	1		
Naphthalene	-		u kı	0				
Nickel	20		m; k; _	254 ()		(2 71		
Phenanthrene	- √	1	us k	20	I			
I henol	- '		us k		 	∤		
Plutomum 238	 		<u> </u>	0	 			
Hutonium 239/240	X		p(1,_	0.3				
l of esstum	- '.'	1	m k	- 12 3 3	1	_ (D(8)		
Pyrene	¹		us k	10				
Scientum	_ '	1	ļin k	1.0	5110	18		

Silver	4	190	m _ե kչ	65 5	5110	24 54
Sodium	18	1200	mg/kg	274 9		1251 24
Strontium	20	41	mg/kg	26 5	613000	211 38
Thallium	1_	0	mg/kg	0.0		1 84
Lin		36	m∈ k⊾	50.0	615000	28 <i>(</i>]
L ramum 234	21	106	pC1 &	8.5	300	2 6
Lranium 235	21	38	pC1 g	2 0	8	0 12
Uranium 238	22	1160	pCı/g	78 7	351	1.5
Vanadium	20	57	ın _է kէ	32 6	7150 292*	88 49
/mc	20	1290	m, kg	170 4	307000	139 1

Above Background
Above Action Level

^{*}AL for protection of wildlife refuge worker/AL for protection of ecological receptor

Table 4 - Summary of Analytical Results for Subsurface Soils at SW-133.4

				s for Subsur		
Analyte	Number of Samples	Maximum Concentration	Unit	Average Concentration	Action I evel	Background
1	above	Concentration	ļ	Concentration		Concentration
	Detection		1]
	1 mut					
Aluminum	١ .	21200	m_k_	12753.6	228000	35 /37
Americium 241	70		pC i ¿	0.0	(00,
Antimony	,	28	mչ, kչ	16 0	109	17.0
Arsenic	\		ուլ ել	1)	" "	1 1
Barium	35	() 7	mg k	199 9	26100	289 ‡
Beryllium	"	1	m_k_	וי	92 8 7 *	14.7
Cidmium	13		m, kį	18 3	962	1.7
Calcium	35	15100	m_k_	(5/)7		39 87 5
Cesmin	I		m ki	170		
Chromium	18	67	ուլ ել	22.6	268	68.3
Cobalt	3,	, 1	ու ե	11.5	1550	29 0
Copper	35	2520	ող ե	609.5	40900	38 <i>2</i>
Cross Alpha	13	363	րСւլ	109 (43.5
Cross Beta	37	606	pC i <u>E</u>	172 6		36 K
Lion	35	107000	ող./kլ	29549 1	307000	410465
Lead	35	935	m_k _E	149.2	1000 97 7*	25 0
Lithium	10		mլ kլ	11.0	20 100	1 /
Magnesium	,	5100	m	2 איי		9 15 1
M mganese	35	998	ող kլ	326 7	3 180	901 (
Mercury	Ī I	i	mį į	0.5	22,700	1 >
Molybdenum	. 1	O.	m_ k_	13.5	5110	25 (
Nickel	15	9,	ms ĸ.	32.7	20100	622
Plutonium 239/240	36		pCτį	0.1	5()	0.02
1 otassium	30	2280	ուջ ել	1416 1		6196.8
Sclenium	11	0	ın k <u>ı</u>	0.0	5110	1 X
Silicon	3	(۲	m_k_	317.0		
Silver	9		mit i	817	5110	24.5
Sodium	34		ույ k _ե	648 ?		1251 3
Strontium	35		m_ k_	12.7	C13000	711 1
1 hallium	11		ուլ ել	00		1 4
f in	11	579	ու ե	168 0	61 5000	286 3
Lianium 234	38		pC i J	50.5	300	2 (
Ut inium 235	37	17	p(1/g	4 5	8	0 12
l ranium 238	38		pC i g	1001	351	15
Vanadium	35		m_ kլ	33.0	7150	XX 5
/inc	35		ուլ kլ	531.2	307000	139 1

Above Background
Above Action Level

^{*}AL for protection of wildlife refuge worker/AL for protection of ecological receptor

Table 5 - Summary of Analytical Results for Subsurface Soils at SW-1702

Analyte	Number of		Unit	Nurae	Action I evel	
	Samples	Concentration		Concentration	1200011 2 0 7 21	Concentration
l	above	,				
	Detection	ŀ				
	l unit	20160				
Aluminum	9		ուջ kչ	175144	228000	35373 1
Americium 241	10		րԸւ չ	0 3	76	0 02
Antimony	2		mը kg	11.5	409	17 0
Arsenie	9		m_ k <u>ւ</u>	10 0	22 2	13 1
Barium	9		mը kg	509 7	26400	289 4
Beryllium	9		ույ kֈ	91 4	921 8 71*	14 2
Cadmium	7		m չ k չ	27 0	962	1.7
C alcium	9	24700		8977 8		39382 3
Cestum	6	9	m <u>ւ</u> kւ	6.2		
Chromium	,		m <u>.</u>	916	_68	65.3
Cobalt	,		m_k_	1187	[550]	_) ()
Copper)	Z44()	m_k_	081	‡0.2C0	
Cross Alpha	1	1	<u> </u>]1(-4		1 >
Cross Beta	11	\ D	Ξ			()
lron)	LC & OFR	n k	10 00 0	0"000	11046
Leid	9	200	ուց եջ	1_23 1	1000 9~ ~	_5 ()
Lithium	9	14	ու ե	10.6	20400	34 7
Magnesium	9	11700	ուք kչ	4656 7		93154
Manganese	9	2150	mը kg	588 6	3480	901 6
Mercury		0.	ու kւ	0.0	25200	1 5
Melybdenum	5		ւո _ե k <u>ե</u>	34 4	5110	25 (
Nickel	9		ıng kբ	94 1	20400	62 2
Plutonium 238	7		p(15	0.0		
l lutonium 239 240	9		p(15	1 6	50	0 02
Potassium	9		m ks	1734 0		6196 8
Sclenium	3		m _E k <u>ւ</u>	5 3	5110	4 8
Silicon	,		mg kբ	503.0		
Silver	8		ւու kւ	74 5	5110	24 5
Sodium	9		ւոց kչ	1254 1		1251 2
Strontium	9		m _e kչ	54.1	61 000	2114
Thallium	5		mը kg	3.4		1.8
lin	7		mբ kբ	49.6	613000	286 3
Uranium 234	11		1(1)	6 8	300	200 3
l ranium 235	ii		[(1]) 7	- 100 H	0.1
t ranium 238	11	9+1		1 0	21	1 5
V an idium	9		mı k.	36.2	7150	88.5
/inc	9		ուբ kչ ուբ kչ	1802 6	30700	139 1

Above Background
Above Action Level

^{*}AL for protection of wildlife refuge worker/AL for protection of ecological receptor

Table 6 - Summary of Analytical Results for Surface Soils and Sediments from the Ash Pits

Analyte	Number of Samples above Detection I imits	Maximum Concentration	l nit	Average Concentration	Action I evel	Background Concentration
Surface Soil Samples						
Arsenic	20	77	mg/kg	5 3	22 2	13 1
Beryllıum	8	16	mg/kg	1 2	921/8 71	14 2
Sediment Samples						
Arsenic	17	173	mg/kg	3 7	22 2	13 1
Beryllıum	10	6 8	mg/kg	1 6	921/8 71	14 2

Table 7 - Summary of Analytical Results Above Tier II Action Levels for Groundwater at the Ash Pits

I ocation	Collection Date	Description	Result	L nats	Above Lier I	Above Lier II	lur I	I ICT II
IHSSs 133 1	and 133 3							
56294	4/27/95	Thallium	59	ug/L	No	Yes	200	2
11155 133 2							1	
58793	3/7/95		44900 0	ug/L	No	Yes	3 65E+06	3 65E+04
58793	8/12/93	Aluminum	64200 0	ug/L	No	Yes	3 65E+06	3 65E+04
63793	5/1/95	Thallium	4 3	ug/L	No	Yes	200	2
63693	1/18/95	Uranium 233, 234	1 3	pCı/L	No	Yes	106	1 06
63793	1/4/95	Uranium 233 234	1 4	pCı/L	No	Yes	106	1 06
63793	5/1/95	Uranium 233 234	41	pCı/L	No	Yes	106	1 06
58793	8/12/93	Uranium 238	0.8	pCı/L	No	Yes	76 8	0 768
58793	6/18/93	Uranium 238	11	pCı/L	No	Yes	76 8	0 768
58793	1/6/95	Uranium 238	3 6	pCı/L	No	Yes	76 8	0 768
63693	1/18/95	Uranium 238	1 3	pCı/L	No	Yes	76 8	0 768
63793	1/4/95	Uranium 238	1 1	pCı/L	No	Yes	76 8	0 768
63793	5/1/95	Uranıum 238	29	pCı/L	No	Yes	76 8	0 768
111559 133 4	and 5W 1702	2						
63093	3/30/94	Methylene Chloride	13 0	ug/L	No	Yes	500	5
63093	5/24/95	Uranium 233 234		pCı/L	No	Yes	106	1 06
63093	5/24/95	Uranium 238	2 4	pCı/L	No	Yes	76 8	0 768

Table 8 - Uranium Concentrations in Groundwater Downgradient of SW-133 4 and SW-1702 (August 2001)

Analyte	Result	l nit	Minimum Detection Activity	lier I Action I evel	licr II Action I cvel
Well 5686					
l ranium 233, 234	0 65	pCı/L	0 046	106	1 06
lrinium 235	U	pCı/L	0 060	135	24
Liantum 238	0 53	pCı/L	0 046	586	103
Well 63093					
Uranium 233_234	2 58	pCı/L	0 068	106	1 06
Lranium 235	0 093	pCı/L	0 048	135	24
l ranium 238	1 92	pCı/L	0 014	586	103

Table 9 - Analytes Detected Above Action Levels in Surface Water Near the Ash Pits

Location	Collection Date	Description	Result	Units	Standard
Mctals			<u> </u>		1
SW041	8/6/90	Aluminum	90 6	ug/L	87
SW041	8/6/90	Alumınum		ug/L	87
SW039	4/12/90	Aluminum	238	ug/L	87
SW041	4/5/90	Aluminum	631	ug/L	87
SW040	7/30/87	Alumınum		ug/L	87
SW041	9/5/90	Antimony	11 4	ug/L	6
SW039	11/8/90	Antimony	14 7	ug/L	6
SW039	9/13/90	Antimony	22 4	ug/L	6
SW041	7/8/91	Antimony	29	ug/L	6
SW039	9/13/90	Antimony	14 4	ug/L	6
SW039	11/8/90	Antimony	15 6	ug/L	6
SW041	6/4/91	Cadmium	19	ug/L	1.5
SW041	7/8/91	Cadmium	2	ug/L	1 5
SW039	6/4/91	Copper	16	ug/L	16
SW041	6/4/91	Copper	28	ug/L	16
SW041	8/5/91	Iron	1010	ug/L	1000
SW041	9/5/91	Iron	1100	ug/L	1000
SW041	4/5/90	Iron	1320	ug/L	1000
SW041	12/4/90	Iron	13900	ug/L	1000
SW041	12/4/90	Iron	13900	ug/L	1000
SW041	11/20/89	Iron	15900	ug/L	1000
SW041	2/6/90	Iron	1970		1000
SW041	6/16/89	Iron	2090	ug/L	1000
SW041	5/3/91	Iron	2670	ug/L	1000
SW041	5/3/91	Iron	2670	ug/L	1000
SW041	2/6/90	Iron	3550	ug/L	1000
SW039	12/4/90	Iron	5390	ug/L	1000
SW039	12/4/90	Iron	5390	ug/L	1000
SW041	5/26/89	Iron	5480	ug/L	1000
SW041	6/4/90	Iron	6800		1000
SW041	12/5/89	Iron	8180		1000
SW039	11/18/91	Lead	8	ug/L	6 5
SW039	12/20/89	Lead		ug/L	6.5
SW041	12/5/89	Lead		ug/L	6.5
SW041	12/4/90	Manganese	1100	ug/L	1000
SW041	12/4/90	Manganese	1100		1000

April 2 2003 22

Table 9 - Analytes Detected Above Action Levels in Surface Water Near the Ash Pits (cont)

Location	Collection Date	Description	Result	Units	Standard
SW039	11/17/89	Mercury	0 33	ug/L	0 01
SW041	5/26/89	Mercury	0 44	ug/L	0 01
SW039	4/6/89	Mercury	03	ug/L	0 01
SW041	3/1/89	Mercury	11	ug/L	0 01
SW039	3/21/90	Mercury	0 25	ug/L	0 01
SW039	4/12/90	Mercury	0.3	ug/L	0 01
SW039	11/17/89	Mercury	0 33	ug/L	0 01
SW039	4/15/92	Silver	2 7	ug/L	06
SW041	12/4/90	Sılver	3 4	ug/L	0 6
SW041	12/4/90	Silver	3 4	ug/L	0 6
SW041	9/5/90	Silver	3 5	ug/L	06
SW041	11/5/90	Silver	98	ug/L	0 6
SW041	7/8/91	Silver	3	ug/L	06
SW041	11/5/90	Silver	98	ug/L	0 6
Radionuclides					
SW039	1/17/90	Americium 241	0 162	pCı/L	0 15
SW039	1/17/90	Americium 241	0 162	pCı/L	0 15
SW041	6/4/90	Gross Alpha	40 1	pCı/L	7
SW041	6/16/89	Gross Alpha	57	pCı/L	7
SW041	1/4/90	Gross Alpha	8 3	pCı/L	7
SW041	1/4/90	Gross Alpha	8 3	pCı/L	7
SW039	7/16/90	Gross Beta	23 69	pCı/L	8
SW041	1/4/90	Gross Beta	14 9	pCı/L	8
SW041	6/4/90	Gross Beta	36	pCı/L	8
SW041	6/16/89	Gross Beta	41	pC1/L	8
SW039	6/27/88	Plutonium 239/240	0 219	pCı/L	0 15

23

April 2 2003